

Official version of JFK death is questionable



CHARLES CRENSHAW

After the publication of my book *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence* (Charles A. Crenshaw, M.D., with Jens Hansen and J. Gary Shaw; Signet) in early April 1992, *The Dallas Morning News* published several articles that acknowledged my presence and participation as one of the attending physicians on the trauma team that tried desper-

ately to save President John Kennedy's life at Parkland Memorial Hospital on Nov. 22, 1963.

Several weeks later, however, a press conference was held in New York by representatives of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* during which I was attacked. Later, *The News* published a Viewpoints column questioning my credibility and accusing me of being motivated in writing the book by a desire for personal recognition and monetary gain. The accusations were untrue and damaging.

Unlike other writers about tragic historical events, researchers and authors who have published evidence of a possible conspiracy in the JFK assassination are typically attacked as liars and profiteers by those with a stake in the lone assassin theory, the apparent goals of such attacks being to silence the messengers or cause them to be ignored.

The differences in my case include the fact that a seemingly prestigious medical journal was used to discredit me among my peers. (*The News* gave JAMA front-page coverage, including a photograph of its editor standing behind the AMA seal, and *The News* referred to the JAMA articles as "the AMA report" when in fact neither the statements at the press conference nor the subsequent articles were endorsed by the AMA.)

It is surprising that *The News* followed the publication of the JAMA article with an editorial that erroneously stated therein that the five Dallas doctors who were interviewed by JAMA agreed with the autopsy results. In truth, Dr. Robert McClelland disagreed, and he still believes that President Kennedy was shot from the front, as I do. Neither I, nor Dr. Kemp Clark nor Dr. Ronald Jones nor many others were interviewed for the JAMA article.

A second major difference between my book and those written by some assassination researchers is that I am neither a conspiracy theorist nor a JFK assassination buff. Instead, I was an eyewitness to history. Primarily, my book includes details of three tragic days at Parkland Hospital when I was a surgical resident and relates my personal account of the events of the Kennedy assassination.

I have been criticized for saying that the fatal wound to President Kennedy entered the front. Yes, without a doubt, I believe the president was shot from the front — not only in the head but also in the throat — and some of the official evidence ignored by government apologists proves this.

On that fateful day in 1963, all of the surgeons in Parkland's Trauma Room No. 1 and numerous other witnesses believed President Kennedy was shot at least once from the front. Testifying under oath, nine physicians who viewed the president's head wound at Parkland reported seeing a large defect in the back of the president's head, indicative of an exit wound caused by a shot from the front.

One free-lance writer for *The News* stated that, "(Dr.) Clark, another Parkland physician working on the president, also believed he saw a large gaping hole in the rear of the president's head." It appears that he made no attempt to contact the other physicians present that day who agree with Dr. Clark and

me, such as Dr. McClelland.

Just as I am not alone in my opinion regarding the president's head wound, neither am I alone regarding the throat wound. Dr. Malcolm Perry was the physician who performed the tracheostomy on the dying president, making the necessary incision through the throat wound. Within two hours of the surgery, at a press conference with Dr. Clark, Dr. Perry described the throat wound three separate times as an "entrance wound" and stated that the bullet which caused the wound was "coming at" the president.

Dr. Jones, another attending physician, also called the wound an "entrance wound" in his report filed that day. Dr. Paul Peters, who also assisted, still called it an entrance wound four months later when he testified before the Warren Commission.

In conclusion, let us reflect on the fact that 31 years have passed since the assassination of President Kennedy, yet according to every poll on the issue, most Americans do not believe that the Warren Commission Report's two lone nuts theory (Lee Harvey Oswald and Jack Ruby) represents the truth.

My book was not written as a historical treatise, but as the recollection of a major event in my life, one that affected me, the history of our nation and the world. Some of the prior publications in *The News* about me appear to be additional examples of unjustified remarks intended to promote the highly controversial "official" version of the Kennedy assassination, thereby perpetuating the conspiracy of silence.

Are my observations threatening to the "official" version? Obviously, an entrance wound to the front of the throat and an exit wound in the back of the head mean at least two assassins.

Charles A. Crenshaw, M.D., is chairman emeritus of the surgery department of John Peter Smith Hospital in Fort Worth. *DMW 3-19-95*

Penelope



Gary Mack
The Sixth Floor

Dallas County Historical Foundation
411 Elm Street • Dallas, Texas 75202-3301

To:

Mr. Harold Weisberg
#100 Route 12
Frederick MD 21701